

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/792,375	03/02/2004	Alvin Scott Williams	81455-5870	4274
28765 7	590 03/23/2006		EXAM	INER
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP			COLE, MONIQUE T	
1700 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1743	

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/792,375	WILLIAMS, ALVIN SCOTT				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Monique T. Cole	1743				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	ON. timely filed time mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 M	larch 2004.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ▼ This	·					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 7-9</u> is/are rejected.						
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>4-6</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc		e Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer. Note the attached Office	ce Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119((a)-(d) or (f).				
 Certified copies of the priority document 						
2. Certified copies of the priority document	• •					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio	•	ved in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	vea.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summa					
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informal	Date I Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/792,375 Page 2

Art Unit: 1743

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 4-6 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to the other claims in the alternative only and cannot depend on another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 5,166,412 to Giersch et al. (herein referred to as "Giersch").

Giersch teaches the following compounds as perfumery ingredients:

Art Unit: 1743

Giersch differs from the instantly claimed compound and composition in that the disclosed compound lacks the C₂ to C₄ alkenyl group. Rather, Giersch teaches a C₂ alkyl group. However, compounds that are position isomers (compounds having the same radicals in physically different positions on the same nucleus) or homologs (compounds differing regularly by the successive addition of the same chemical group, e.g., by -CH2- groups) are generally of sufficiently close structural similarity that there is a presumed expectation that such compounds possess similar properties. In re Wilder, 563 F.2d 457, 195 USPQ 426 (CCPA 1977). See also In re May, 574 F.2d 1082, 197 USPQ 601 (CCPA 1978) (stereoisomers prima facie obvious). Prior art structures do not have to be true homologs or isomers to render structurally similar compounds prima facie obvious. In re Payne, 606 F.2d 303, 203 USPQ 245 (CCPA 1979) (Claimed and prior art compounds were both directed to heterocyclic carbamoyloximino compounds having pesticidal activity. The only structural difference between the claimed and prior art compounds was that the ring structures of the claimed compounds had two carbon

Art Unit: 1743

atoms between two sulfur atoms whereas the prior art ring structures had either one or three carbon atoms between two sulfur atoms. The court held that although the prior art compounds were not true homologs or isomers of the claimed compounds, the similarity between the chemical structures and properties is sufficiently close that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the claimed compounds in searching for new pesticides.).

Emphasis added. Here, the claimed compound and the Giersch compounds are very similar and directed to the same field of endeavor. The structures and properties are sufficiently close that one of ordinary skill would have expected that such a slight variation in the chemical structure would not adversely affect the scent properties of the compound, absent any evidence to the contrary.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monique T. Cole whose telephone number is 571-272-1255. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday & Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/792,375

Art Unit: 1743

Monique T. Cole Primary Examiner Art Unit 1743 Page 5

mtc